arXiv:1610.06031v1 [math.AP] 19 Oct 2016

Uniqueness of viscosity mean curvature flow solution in two sub-Riemannian structures

E. Baspinar* G. Citti†

1 Introduction

Mean curvature flow describes the evolution of a surface whose points move in the normal direction, with speed equal to the curvature. The first results in the Euclidean setting have been proven by Altschuler-Grayson [1], Gage [21, 23], Gage-Hamilton [22], Grayson [24] and Huisken [25], with differential geometry methods. Since mean curvature flow can develop singularities even for initially smooth surfaces, (see for example [18]), different notions of weak solution were proposed, to study the flow after singularities: Brakke introduced in [3] an approach based on the notion of varifold and geometric measure theory, Evans-Spruck [18, 15, 16, 17] and Chen-Giga-Goto [7] independently studied existence and uniqueness of viscosity solutions via level set methods.

The level set method identifies the evolving surface at time t as level set $M_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ u(x,t) = 0\}$ of a function u, which is solution of a differential equation. In the Euclidean setting the curvature can be expressed as $K = \text{div}\left(\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}\right)$ and the mean curvature flow equation reads:

$$\partial_t u(x,t) = |\nabla u| K = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \Big(\delta_{ij} - \frac{\partial_{x_i} u \, \partial_{x_j} u}{|\nabla u|^2}\Big)\partial_{x_i x_j} u.$$

The present paper focuses on the sub-Riemannian analogue of the mean curvature flow in a group G of topological dimension 3, which can be either the Heisenberg group H^1 or the group of rigid motion SE(2). A sub-Riemannian structure on one of these groups is defined by a triple (G, HG, g_0), where G is the group, HG a sub-bundle of the tangent space TG and g_0 a metric on HG. The space has the bracket generating properties at step 2, i.e., denoting (X_1, X_2) a basis of HG at every point, X_1, X_2, and $[X_1,\ X_2]$ span the tangent space to G at every point where $[.,.]$ is the corresponding Lie bracket. Finally we will choose a metric g_0 on HG, which will make X_1 and X_2 orthonormal. In particular while considering SE(2), the underlying manifold will be $G = R^2 \times S^1$, its elements will be expressed by $\xi = (x, y, \theta) \in \mathrm{SE}(2)$ so that $x,\ y$ denote the spatial components and θ the angular component. We will make the choice of vector fields

$$X_1 = \cos(\theta)\partial_x + \sin(\theta)\partial_y, \quad X_2 = \partial_\theta,$$

at all $\xi \in G$, which satisfy the bracket generating condition, as it is easy to verify. While studying the Heisenberg group we will choose the underlying manifold as $G = \mathbb{R}^3$ whose elements will be denoted $\xi = (x, y, \theta)$, with the choice of vector fields

$$X_1 = \partial_x - \frac{y}{2}\partial_\theta, \quad X_2 = \partial_y + \frac{x}{2}\partial_\theta.$$

We explicitly note that the Heisenberg group can be considered as the limit structure obtained from SE(2) via a blow up procedure (see [34], [50] and [60]), hence those two structures, which have completely different group laws, share the same local structure. This is why they can be studied together, and they can be used as models of the same types of problems. In particular the interest in studying motion by curvature in these two groups comes from application of image impainting through models of the visual cortex. The first layer (V1) of mammalian visual cortex was modeled as a smooth sub-Riemannian surface with local structure of the Heisenberg group in [28], and with the SE(2) geometry in [10]. As a

*University of Bologna, Department of Mathematics.
†University of Bologna, Department of Mathematics.

consequence, models of image completion inspired by the functionality of the cortex has been proposed in [26] and [10].

Differential calculus in sub-Riemannian spaces is very well established (see for example [27]). In particular the horizontal gradient of a function is defined as

$$\nabla_0 = (X_1, X_2).$$

The notion of regular surface in this setting has been introduced by Franchi, Serapioni and Cassano [20]. It can be defined as zero level set $M = \{\xi \in G : u(\xi) = 0\}$ of a smooth function u, whose horizontal gradient does not vanish. However even surfaces which are regular in the Euclidean sense, present points at which the horizontal gradient vanishes and we call those points characteristic points. The set of such points will be denoted by $\Sigma(M) = \{\xi \in M : \ \left|\nabla_0 u(\xi, t)\right| = 0\}$. At non characteristic points the horizontal normal is defined as

$$\nu_0 = \frac{\nabla_0 u}{|\nabla_0 u|},$$

and the horizontal mean curvature of the manifold M is given by

$$K_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{2} X_i \nu_{0,i}.$$

This notion has been introduced in general setting in [12]. Results on mean curvature equation in the special setting of the Heisenberg group were provided in [6], [4], [5], [19] and in SE(2) by [9]. We refer to [4] for more detailed references.

As in the Euclidean setting horizontal mean curvature flow is the evolution of a surface $M_0 \subset G$, with normal speed equal to the horizontal mean curvature. If M_0 is the level set of a function u_0, the flow at time t will be identified as the level set $M_t = \{\xi \in G : \ u(\xi, t) = 0\}$ of the solution of the following degenerate problem:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = \sum\limits_{i,j=1}^{2} \Big(\delta_{ij} - \frac{X_i u X_j u}{|\nabla_0 u|^2}\Big)(X_i X_j)u & \text{in } G \times (0, \infty) \\ u(., 0) = u_0(.) \quad \text{on } G \times \{0\}. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

Existence of a viscosity solution is known in a very general setting, (see for example [4] and [9]), while the problem of uniqueness is still largely open. Capogna and Citti [4] proved uniqueness of evolving graphs over a Carnot group, since graphs have no characteristic points [14]. In the special case of the Heisenberg group H^1 Ferrari, Liu and Manfredi [19] provided uniqueness under the assumption of axisymmetricity of solutions to (1). Their definition of solution is the viscosity solution in Crandall-Ishii-Lions sense (see [11], [13] and [8] for more details).

Here we drop such aforementioned symmetry assumptions and we prove the following comparison principle for viscosity solutions of problem (1):

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that u and v are Lipschitz continuous viscosity solutions of problem* (1) *such that*

- *there exists $R > 0$ with $u = 0$, $v = 0$ for $|\xi| > R$,*
- *$u \leq v$ at time $t = 0$.*

Then $u \leq v$ for every $t > 0$.

The proof relies on a regularization procedure. More precisely for an open ball $B(0, R)$ with radius R centered at the origin we introduce the regularized problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^\epsilon = \sum\limits_{i,j=1}^{2} \Big(\delta_{ij} - \dfrac{X_i u^\epsilon X_j u^\epsilon}{|\nabla_0 u^\epsilon|^2 + \epsilon^2}\Big)(X_i X_j)u^\epsilon & \text{in } B(0, R) \times (0, \infty) \\ u^\epsilon(., 0) = u_0(.) \quad \text{on } B(0, R) \times \{0\} \\ u^\epsilon(., t) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B(0, R) \times [0, T], \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

and the same problem on the whole space

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u^\epsilon = \sum\limits_{i,j=1}^{2} \Big(\delta_{ij} - \dfrac{X_i u^\epsilon X_j u^\epsilon}{|\nabla_0 u^\epsilon|^2 + \epsilon^2}\Big)(X_i X_j) u^\epsilon \quad \text{in } G \times (0,\infty) \\ u^\epsilon(.,\,0) = u_0(.) \quad \text{on } G \times \{0\}. \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Then we will use the following *vanishing* viscosity solution definition:

Definition 1. *A function u is called Lipschitz continuous vanishing viscosity solution of* (1) *if there exists a constant $C > 0$ and for any $\epsilon > 0$, and R there exists a solution $u^{\epsilon,R}$ of the problem* (2) *such that*

- $||u^{\epsilon,R}||_\infty + ||\nabla_E u^{\epsilon,R}||_\infty \leq C$ *where ∇_E denotes Euclidean gradient,*
- *there exists a function u^ϵ which is a solution of the problem* (3) *such that $u^\epsilon = \lim_{R\to+\infty} u^{\epsilon,R}$,*
- $u = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} u^\epsilon$.

This definition immediately implies that comparison and uniqueness are satisfied for vanishing viscosity solutions. The same result will be extended to viscosity solution via a local approximation. Indeed the crucial idea of the paper is to establish the following approximation result:

Theorem 1.2. *Let v be a Lipschitz continuous viscosity solution of the problem* (1) *constantly equal to* 0 *outside of a compact set, and let u be a vanishing viscosity solution in the sense of Definition 1. For every $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $0 < T < \infty$ there exists a constant $M = M(u_0, T, \alpha)$ such that*

$$\sup_{\xi\in SE(2), 0\leq t\leq T} |(v - u^\epsilon)(\xi, t)| \leq M\epsilon^\alpha,$$

for all $0 < \epsilon < 1$.

As a consequence we recognize that the two notions of viscosity solution coincide. This assertion was already known in the Euclidean setting under the weaker assumption of that u is only continuous (see [13]) and we obtain it where we assume that v is Lipschitz continuous. Indeed from Theorem 1.2 we also deduce that

Corollary 1.2.1. *Any Lipschitz continuous viscosity solution v is indeed a vanishing viscosity solution.*

The proof of Theorem 1.2 generalizes the proof of Deckelnick [13], which is in the Euclidean setting, to our setting . Comparison principle of viscosity solutions is based on maximization of

$$w(\xi, \eta, t) = u(\xi, t) - v(\eta, t) - \phi(\xi, \eta, t),$$

for a suitable function ϕ where $\xi, \eta \in G$. This function must satisfy
i) the second order derivatives vanish when the first order ones do,
ii) $\partial_\xi \phi = -\partial_\eta \phi$.
As noted by Ferrari, Liu and Manfredi [19] the main difficulty in extending the classical approach to sub-Riemannian setting is to find a function ϕ satisfying the condition analogous to ii), and expressed in terms of vector fields. Here we choose a function of the horizontal variables alone.

Note that, with the approximation (3) we give a formal meaning to regularized operator $|\nabla_0 u| K_0$ at characteristic points. Indeed, formally if ξ is characteristic for every $\epsilon > 0$ then

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \Big(\delta_{ij} - \frac{X_i u(\xi) X_j u(\xi)}{|\nabla_0 u(\xi)|^2 + \epsilon^2}\Big) X_i X_j(u(\xi)) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} X_i X_i u(\xi),$$

which is the Laplace operator of the function u in this setting.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide some basics of SE(2) and H^1 sub-Riemannian geometries. In particular, we provide the notions of vanishing viscosity and viscosity, and describe the generalized flow. In Section 3 we provide some geometric properties of vanishing viscosity solutions. Finally we prove Theorem 1.2. From this we deduce the comparison principle and uniqueness result for viscosity solutions. As a corollary we get a stability result for vanishing viscosity solutions

Theorem 1.3. *For every $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $0 < T < \infty$ there exists a constant $M = M(u_0, T, \alpha)$ such that*

$$\sup_{\xi \in G, 0 \le t \le T} |(u^{\epsilon_1} - u^{\epsilon_2})(\xi, t)| \le M(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)^{\alpha},$$

for all $0 < \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 < 1$ and $\epsilon_2 < \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}$.

2 Definitions and preliminary results

2.1 Definition of viscosity and vanishing viscosity solutions

We define superjets $\mathcal{P}^{2,+}u(\xi,t)$ and $\mathcal{P}^{2,-}u(\xi,t)$, by following [13], as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}^{2,+}u(\xi,t) := \{(a,p,X) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{S}(n) \mid u(\eta,s) \le u(\xi,t) + a(s-t) + \langle p, \eta - \xi\rangle \\ + \frac{1}{2}\langle X(\eta-\xi), \eta-\xi\rangle + o(|s-t| + |\eta-\xi|^2) \quad \text{as} \quad (\eta,s) \to (\xi,t)\},\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{P}^{2,-}u(\xi,t) = -\mathcal{P}^{2,+}(-u)(\xi,t)$ with $\mathcal{S}(n)$ representing the group of $n \times n$ symmetric matrices. The closure of $\mathcal{P}^{2,+}u(\xi,t)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}u(\xi,t) := \{(a,p,X) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{S}(n) \mid \exists (\xi_m, t_m, a_m, p_m, X_m) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times [0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{S}(n) \\ \text{with } (a_m, p_m, X_m) \in \mathcal{P}^{2,+}u(\xi_m, t_m) \text{ and } (\xi_m, t_m, a_m, p_m, X_m) \to (\xi, t, a, p, X) \text{ as } m \to \infty\},\end{aligned}$$

and in a similar way for $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-}u(\xi,t)$.

Then viscosity solution is defined as follows:

Definition 2. *A function $u \in C^0(G \times [0,\infty))$ is called a viscosity subsolution of (1) if for every $(\xi_0, t_0) \in G \times (0,\infty)$ and every $(a,p,X) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}u(\xi_0,t_0)$ it is provided that*

$$\begin{aligned} a &\le \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \Big(\delta_{ij} - \frac{p_i p_j}{|p|^2}\Big) X_{ij} \quad \text{if} \quad p \neq 0, \\ a &\le (\delta_{ij} - q_i q_j) X_{ij} \quad \text{for some} \quad |q| \le 1, \quad \text{if} \quad p = 0. \end{aligned}$$

A viscosity supersolution is defined analogously where $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}u(\xi_0,t_0)$ is replaced by $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-}u(\xi_0,t_0)$ and $\le$ by $\ge$. A viscosity solution to (1) is a function $u \in C^0(G \times [0,\infty))$ which is both a subsolution and supersolution.

We explicitly remark that the set of viscosity solutions refer to a larger set than the set of vanishing viscosity solutions. In other words, a vanishing viscosity solution to (1) is the viscosity solution which is the limit of a solution to (3) as $\epsilon \to 0$. Consequently vanishing viscosity solutions are also viscosity solutions (see also [9]) while vice versa will be proved in the present paper.

2.2 Existence and comparison results

In [18] the existence of vanishing viscosity solution of Euclidean mean curvature flow was established under the assumption that the initial condition is identically 1 at infinity. The same theorem is already known in the two groups considered here: $G = \mathrm{SE}(2)$ and Carnot groups (see [4] for Carnot groups and [9] for SE(2)).

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that G is either a Carnot group or SE(2). Assume that the initial datum u_0 is of class $C^1_E(G)$ (i.e., in the Euclidean sense) and there is a sphere of radius R such that u_0 is identically constant out of this sphere. We denote the standard Euclidean gradient with ∇_E. There is a constant $\tilde{C}$ such that*

$$\tilde{C} \ge \max(\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(G)}, \|\nabla_E u_0\|_{L^\infty(G)})$$

and for every ϵ the solution of problem (3) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^\epsilon(.,t)\|_{L^\infty(G)} &\le \tilde{C}, \\ \|\nabla_E u^\epsilon(.,t)\|_{L^\infty(G)} &\le \tilde{C}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, there exists a Lipschitz continous vanishing viscosity solution u of problem (1) *which satisfies*

$$\|u(.,t)\|_{L^\infty(G)} \leq \tilde{C},$$
$$\|\nabla_E u(.,t)\|_{L^\infty(G)} \leq \tilde{C}.$$

Recall that the regularized equation (3) has no critical points, hence comparison for viscosity solutions of the equation in the Carnot groups setting has been established by Capogna and Citti [4].

The proof of Theorem 2.1 in [9] is obtained via approximation, starting with vanishing viscosity solutions, in the sense of Definition 1. Using this explicit construction, the following weak version of the comparison principle, follows:

Theorem 2.2. *Let G be a Carnot group or SE(2). Assume that u is a vanishing viscosity solution of* (1) *according to Definition 1 and denote v a bounded weak vanishing supersolution of* (1)*, identically constant out of a compact set. Suppose further*

(i) For all $x \in G$, $u(x,0) \leq v(x,0)$,

(ii) u and v are uniformly continuous when restricted to $G \times \{t = 0\}$.

Then $u(x,t) \leq v(x,t)$ for all $x \in G$ and $t \geq 0$.

Proof. The solution $u^{\epsilon,R}$ defined on the bounded cylinder satisfies the maximum and comparison principle. As a consequence these properties are inherited by the limit function u^ϵ.

□

3 Asymptotic behavior of solutions

In this section we establish the asymptotic behavior of solutions of equations (1) and (3) whose Euclidean analogue has been proven by Evans [18], and extended to Carnot groups in [4]. The proof is based on comparison with ad hoc auxiliary function. Since at this stage we have comparison principle only for the vanishing solutions, the geometrical result holds only for that type of solutions.

3.1 Asymptotic behavior of the vanishing viscosity solution

In the Euclidean and Carnot settings it is known that if the level sets of the initial datum are confined in some bounded region, then the corresponding level set of the solution remains in the same region during the whole flow. This result in Carnot groups can be stated by following Theorem 5.6 in [4] as:

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that G is a Carnot group $u_0 \in C^\infty(G)$ and there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that*

$$u_0(\xi) \text{ is constant for all } \xi \in G \text{ satisfying } |\xi| \geq K \ .$$

Then there exists $R > 0$ dependent only on K such that any vanishing viscosity solution of (1) *satisfies*

$$u(\xi,t) \text{ is constant for all } \xi \in G \text{ satisfying } |\xi| \geq R \text{ and for all } t > 0.$$

Here we prove the same asymptotic behavior in SE(2). Clearly, if $\xi \in \mathrm{SE}(2)$ and $\xi = (x,y,\theta)$ it is sufficient to control the (x,y) variables in a neighborhood of infinity. Precisely we prove

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that $u_0 \in C^\infty(SE(2))$ and it is constant at the exterior of a cylinder. More precisely there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that*

$$u_0(\xi) \text{ is constant for all } \xi \in SE(2) \text{ satisfying } |\xi| \geq K \ .$$

Then there is $R > 0$ dependent only on K such that the vanishing viscosity solution u satisfies

$$u(\xi,t) \text{ is constant for all } \xi \in SE(2) \text{ satisfying } |\xi| \geq R \text{ and for all } t > 0,$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let us choose $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and let $h(\xi) = \frac{x^2+y^2}{2}$. For all $\xi \in G$, $t > 0$ let us call*

$$V_\epsilon(\xi,t) = \Psi\Big(h(\xi) + t\varepsilon\Big) - Ct\epsilon^{1/2} \quad \text{with } \Psi(s) \equiv \begin{cases} 0 & (s \geq 2), \\ (s-2)^3 & (0 \leq s \leq 2). \end{cases}$$

Then the function V^ϵ satisfies

$$V_t^\epsilon - \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{X_i V^\epsilon X_j V^\epsilon}{\epsilon^2 + |\nabla_0 V^\epsilon|^2} \right) (X_i X_j) V^\epsilon \leq 0,$$

and at the initial time $t = 0$

$$V^\epsilon(\xi, 0) = 0 \ \ \textit{if} \ \ h(\xi) \geq 2, \quad -1 \leq V^\epsilon(\xi, 0) \leq 0 \ \ \textit{if} \ \ 1 \leq h(\xi) \leq 2, \quad V^\epsilon(\xi, 0) \leq -1 \ \ \textit{if} \ \ 0 \leq h(\xi) \leq 1, \tag{4}$$

Proof. $\Psi \in \mathcal{C}^2\big([0, \infty)\big)$,

$$\Psi'(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & (s \geq 2), \\ 3(s-2)^2 & (0 \leq s \leq 2), \end{cases} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Psi''(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & (s \geq 2), \\ 6(s-2) & (0 \leq s \leq 2). \end{cases}$$

From this explicit expression it immediately follows that $\Psi' \geq 0$, $\Psi'' \leq 0$ and $\Psi \leq 0$, $|\Psi''| \leq 2\sqrt{3}\left(\Psi'\right)^{1/2}$, $|\Psi'|, |\Psi''| \leq 12$, for all $s > 0$. Besides if we call

$$v^\varepsilon(\xi, t) = \Psi\Big(h(\xi) + t\varepsilon\Big),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} X_i v^\epsilon(\xi, t) =& \Psi'(h(\xi) + \epsilon t) X_i h, \\ (X_i X_j) v^\epsilon(\xi, t) =& \Psi'(h(\xi) + \epsilon t) X_i X_j h + \Psi''(h(\xi) + \epsilon t) X_i h X_j h. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

If so we see

$$\begin{aligned} v_t^\epsilon - \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{X_i v^\epsilon X_j v^\epsilon}{\epsilon^2 + |\nabla_0 v^\epsilon|^2} \right) (X_i X_j) v^\epsilon = \\ = \epsilon \Psi' - \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{(\Psi')^2 X_i h X_j h}{\epsilon^2 + (\Psi')^2 |\nabla_0 h|^2} \right) (\Psi' X_i X_j h + \Psi'' X_i h X_j h) \\ = \epsilon \Psi' - \left(\delta_{11} - \frac{(\Psi')^2 X_1 h X_1 h}{\epsilon^2 + (\Psi')^2 |\nabla_0 h|^2} \right) (\Psi' X_1 X_1 h + \Psi'' X_1 h X_1 h), \end{aligned}$$

since $X_2 h = X_2 X_2 h = 0$. For this same reason we have

$$\delta_{11} - \frac{(\Psi')^2 X_1 h X_1 h}{\epsilon^2 + (\Psi')^2 |\nabla_0 h|^2} = \frac{\epsilon^2}{\epsilon^2 + (\Psi')^2 |X_1 h|^2}$$

Using the fact that $\Psi'' \leq 0$, $\Psi' X_1 X_1 h \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v_t^\epsilon - \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{X_i v^\epsilon X_j v^\epsilon}{\epsilon^2 + |\nabla_0 v^\epsilon|^2} \right) (X_i X_j) v^\epsilon \leq \varepsilon \Psi' - \frac{\epsilon^2 \Psi'' |X_1 h|^2}{\epsilon^2 + (\Psi')^2 |X_1 h|^2} \leq \\ \leq \epsilon \Psi' + \frac{\epsilon^2 |\Psi''| |X_1 h|^2}{\epsilon^2 + (\Psi')^2 |X_1 h|^2} \leq \epsilon \Psi' + \frac{2\sqrt{3} \epsilon^2 |\Psi'|^{1/2} |X_1 h|^2}{\epsilon^2 + (\Psi')^2 |X_1 h|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

We can assume here that $h(\xi) < 2$, since otherwise the thesis is trivially true. And in this set $|\nabla_0 h|^2$ is bounded.

We have two cases. The first one is $\epsilon > \Psi'$ resulting in

$$\epsilon \Psi' + \frac{2\sqrt{3} \epsilon^2 |\Psi'|^{1/2} |\nabla_0 h|^2}{\epsilon^2 + (\Psi')^2 |\nabla_0 h|^2} \leq \epsilon \Psi' + \frac{8\sqrt{3}\, \epsilon^{5/2} |\nabla_0 h|^2}{\epsilon^2} \leq \epsilon^{1/2} \Psi' + 32\sqrt{3} \epsilon^{1/2} \leq C \epsilon^{1/2}. \tag{6}$$

In the second case where now $\epsilon < \Psi'$ we find the same estimate as

$$\epsilon\Psi' + \frac{2\sqrt{3}\epsilon^2|\Psi'|^{1/2}|\nabla_0 h|^2}{\epsilon^2 + (\Psi')^2|\nabla_0 h|^2} \leq \epsilon\Psi' + \frac{2\sqrt{3}\epsilon^2(\Psi')^{1/2}}{(\Psi')^2} \leq \epsilon\Psi' + \frac{2\sqrt{3}\epsilon^2}{(\Psi')^{3/2}}$$
$$\leq \epsilon\Psi' + \frac{2\sqrt{3}\epsilon^2}{\epsilon^{3/2}} \leq \epsilon^{1/2}\Psi' + 2\sqrt{3}\epsilon^{1/2} \leq C\epsilon^{1/2}.$$

We immediately deduce that V_ϵ satisfies

$$V_t^\epsilon - \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{X_i V^\epsilon X_j V^\epsilon}{\epsilon^2 + |\nabla_0 V^\epsilon|^2} \right) (X_i X_j) V^\epsilon \leq 0,$$

and at the initial time $t = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} &V^\epsilon(\xi, 0) = 0 && \text{if} \quad h(\xi) \geq 2, \\ &-1 \leq V^\epsilon(\xi, 0) \leq 0 && \text{if} \quad 1 \leq h(\xi) \leq 2, \\ &V^\epsilon(\xi, 0) \leq -1 && \text{if} \quad 0 \leq h(\xi) \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we can provide the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Proof. By Lemma 3.3 we know that there exists a function V such that

$$V^\epsilon(p, t) := v^\epsilon(p, t) - tC\epsilon^{1/2},$$

where C is the constant in (6). Besides V^ϵ satisfies

$$V_t^\epsilon - \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{X_i V^\epsilon X_j V^\epsilon}{\epsilon^2 + |\nabla_0 V^\epsilon|^2} \right) (X_i X_j) V^\epsilon \leq 0,$$

and conditions (4) at the initial time $t = 0$, i.e., $V^\epsilon(\xi, 0) \leq u_0(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \mathrm{SE}(2)$.

Applying the comparison principle to the vanishing viscosity solutions of regularized mean curvature equation we deduce that $V^\epsilon \leq u^\epsilon$ in $\mathrm{SE}(2) \times [0, \infty)$ for each $0 < \epsilon < 1$. This result implies

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} V^\epsilon = \Psi\Big(\frac{|x|^2 + |y|^2}{2}\Big) = 0 \leq u(p, t), \tag{7}$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $\xi = (x, y, \theta) \in \mathrm{SE}(2)$ satisfying $(|x|^2 + |y|^2)/2 \geq 2$. Hence $u \geq 0$ if $(|x|^2 + |y|^2)/2 \geq 2$. Arguing in the same way with the function $\tilde{V}^\epsilon = -V^\epsilon$, we deduce

$$u \leq 0 \quad \text{if} \quad (|x|^2 + |y|^2)/2 \geq 2. \tag{8}$$

Hence (7) and (8) give $u(\xi, t) = 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $\xi = (x, y, \theta)$ such that $(|x|^2 + |y|^2)/2 \geq 2$. □

3.2 Asymptotic behavior of the approximating solutions

Here we prove that the solutions of problem (3), obtained as limit of solutions of problem (2) exponentially tend to a constant value.

Theorem 3.4. *Let G be either the Heisenberg group H^1 or SE(2), and let u^ϵ be the solution of problem (3), obtained as limit of solutions of problem (2). For each $\epsilon > 0$ there exist some finite numbers $B, b > 0$ independent of ϵ such that*

$$\big|1 - u^\epsilon(\xi, t)\big| \leq B e^{-b(x^2+y^2)} \quad \textit{for all } (\xi, t) \in H^1 \times [0, T],$$

where T is some positive finite number denoting the final time.

Proof. The proof is based on comparing the function $1-u^\epsilon$ with the auxiliary function

$$v^\epsilon(\xi,t)=\Psi(h(\xi)) \quad \text{where} \quad h(\xi)=x^2+y^2, \quad \Psi(s)=\hat{c}\mathrm{e}^{-\sigma(2T-\alpha t)s},$$

with $0<\alpha<1,\ 0<\sigma<\infty$ and constant $\hat{c}=2\mathrm{e}^{4\sigma T}$. As before we assume that

$$|u_0|\leq 1 \text{ on } G, \quad u_0=0 \quad \text{in } |x|^2+|y|^2\geq 1. \tag{9}$$

Now we proceed by using a procedure similar to the one in the proof of [2, Theorem 5.1], and we show that both in H^1 and in SE(2) we have

$$v_t^\epsilon-\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\left(\delta_{ij}-\frac{X_iv^\epsilon X_jv^\epsilon}{\epsilon^2+|X_jv^\epsilon|^2}\right)(X_iX_j)v^\epsilon\geq 0$$

Using the derivatives of v^ϵ computed in (5) the curvature operator on the function v^ϵ becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}&v_t^\epsilon-\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\left(\delta_{ij}-\frac{X_iv^\epsilon X_jv^\epsilon}{\epsilon^2+|\nabla_0v^\epsilon|^2}\right)(X_iX_j)v^\epsilon\\ =&v_t^\epsilon-\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\left(\delta_{ij}-\frac{(\Psi')^2X_ihX_jh}{\epsilon^2+(\Psi')^2|\nabla_0h|^2}\right)(\Psi'X_iX_jh+\Psi''X_ihX_jh).\end{aligned}$$

In H^1 we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}&v_t^\epsilon-\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\left(\delta_{ij}-\frac{X_iv^\epsilon X_jv^\epsilon}{\epsilon^2+|\nabla_0v^\epsilon|^2}\right)(X_iX_j)v^\epsilon\\ \geq&v_t^\epsilon-\left(\delta_{11}-\frac{(\Psi')^2(X_1h)^2}{\epsilon^2+(\Psi')^2|\nabla_0h|^2}\right)\Psi''(X_1h)^2-\left(\delta_{22}-\frac{(\Psi')^2(X_2h)^2}{\epsilon^2+(\Psi')^2|\nabla_0h|^2}\right)\Psi''(X_2h)^2,\end{aligned}$$

since $\Psi'<0$ and $\Psi''>0$. The previous expression then becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}&v_t^\epsilon-\frac{\epsilon^2\Psi''((X_1h)^2+(X_2h)^2)}{\epsilon^2+(\Psi')^2|\nabla_0h|^2}-2\frac{(\Psi')^2\Psi''(X_1h)^2(X_2h)^2}{\epsilon^2+(\Psi')^2|\nabla_0h|^2}\\ =&\sigma\alpha(x^2+y^2)\Psi-\frac{4\epsilon^2\sigma^2(2T-\alpha t)^2\Psi(x^2+y^2)}{\epsilon^2+(\Psi')^2(x^2+y^2)}-\frac{64\sigma^4(2T-\alpha t)^4x^2y^2\Psi^3}{\epsilon^2+(\Psi')^2(x^2+y^2)}\\ \geq&\frac{\epsilon^2\sigma(x^2+y^2)\Psi(\alpha-16\sigma T^2)}{\epsilon^2+(\Psi')^2(x^2+y^2)}+\frac{(\Psi')^2\sigma\Psi(x^2+y^2)^2(\alpha-256\sigma T^2)}{\epsilon^2+(\Psi')^2(x^2+y^2)}\geq 0,\end{aligned}$$

if σ is small. Analogously, in SE(2) we get

$$\begin{aligned}&v_t^\epsilon-\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\left(\delta_{ij}-\frac{X_iv^\epsilon X_jv^\epsilon}{\epsilon^2+|\nabla_0v^\epsilon|^2}\right)(X_iX_j)v^\epsilon=v_t^\epsilon-\frac{\epsilon^2\Psi''|X_1h|^2}{\epsilon^2+(\Psi')^2|X_1h|^2}\\ &=\sigma\alpha(x^2+y^2)\Psi-\frac{\epsilon^2\sigma^2(2T-\alpha t)^2\Psi(x\cos(\theta)+y\sin(\theta))^2}{\epsilon^2+|\nabla_0v^\epsilon|^2}\geq\\ &\geq\frac{\epsilon\sigma(x^2+y^2)\Psi(\alpha-4T^2\sigma)}{\epsilon^2+|\nabla_0v^\epsilon|^2}\geq 0\end{aligned}$$

if σ is sufficiently small.

Note that

$$(1-u^\epsilon)_t-\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\left(\delta_{ij}-\frac{X_i(1-u^\epsilon)X_j(1-u^\epsilon)}{\epsilon^2+|\nabla_0(1-u^\epsilon)|^2}\right)(X_iX_j)(1-u^\epsilon)=0.$$

Recall that $0\leq|1-u_0|\leq 2$ due to (9). Hence, applying comparison principle to the functions $1-u^\epsilon$ (as well as $u^\epsilon-1$) and v^ϵ we get

$$|1-u^\epsilon|\leq v^\epsilon \quad \text{in } \mathrm{H}^1\times[0,T].$$

The proof is complete. □

4 Viscosity and vanishing viscosity solutions

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2 which says that any viscosity solution is limit of a family of special vanishing viscosity solutions obtained with the procedure of [13].

We choose a parameter γ such that

$$\gamma = \frac{2(1-\alpha)}{1-2\alpha} > 2. \tag{10}$$

Let us denote any point of G with $\xi = (\bar{\xi}, \tilde{\xi})$, where $\bar{\xi}$ denotes one horizontal variables. In particular here we will use $\bar{\xi} = \theta_\xi$ corresponding to any point $\xi = (x, y, \theta_\xi) \in \mathrm{SE}(2)$ and $\bar{\xi} = y_\xi$ for any point $\xi = (x_\xi, y_\xi, \theta) \in \mathrm{H}^1$.

Then we define

$$d_0(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}) = |\sin(\bar{\xi} - \bar{\eta})| \quad \text{in} \quad \mathrm{SE}(2), \qquad\qquad d_0(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}) = |\bar{\xi} - \bar{\eta}| \quad \text{in} \quad \mathrm{H}^1 \ .$$

The main reason of the choice is that for every horizontal vector X_i with $i \neq 2$ $X_i^\xi \phi = -X_i^\eta \phi$, and $X_2^\xi \phi = -X_2^\eta \phi$. Besides we introduce the function

$$\phi(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}, t) = \frac{\mu}{\gamma} \epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} d_0(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta})^\gamma + \frac{Mt}{2T} \epsilon^\alpha.$$

If u and u^ϵ are Lipschitz functions with the same initial condition $u(\xi, 0) = u^\epsilon(\xi, 0)$, we denote

$$\omega(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}, \tilde{\zeta}, t) = u(\bar{\xi}, \tilde{\zeta}, t) - u^\epsilon(\bar{\eta}, \tilde{\zeta}, t) - \phi(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}, t), \tag{11}$$

for suitable constants $M \geq 0$ and $0 < \epsilon$, and with

$$\mu = \frac{\gamma 4^\gamma \mathrm{Lip}(u_0)^\gamma}{M^{\gamma-1}}, \quad 1 - \frac{\gamma}{2} - \alpha(\gamma - 1) < 0 \tag{12}$$

with $\mathrm{Lip}(u_0)$ denoting Lipschitz constant of u_0, with respect to the distance $d_0(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta})$.

We will also use the notation $|\xi|$ to denote a distance from the origin which can describe a neighborhood of infinity. As before we denote

$$|\xi| = \left(x_\xi^2 + y_\xi^2\right)^{1/2} \quad \text{in } \mathrm{SE}(2), \quad |\xi| = \left(x_\xi^2 + y_\xi^2 + \theta^2\right)^{1/2} \quad \text{in } \mathrm{H}^1.$$

and we assume that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$d_0(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}) \leq C|\xi - \eta|,$$

for $|\xi - \eta|$ sufficiently large.

Lemma 4.1. *Let u and v be Lipschitz continuous functions such that $u(\xi, 0) = v(\xi, 0)$, for every $\xi \in G$, such that*

$$\sup_{\xi \in G, 0 \leq t \leq T} (u - v)(\xi, t) > 0. \tag{13}$$

Let d_0 be a Lipschitz nonnegative function, which is a distance in the variables $\bar{\xi}$ alone $d_0(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\xi}) = 0$ for every $\xi \in G$, and let ω be the function defined in (11)*. Assume that*

- *There exist constants B_ϵ, b_ϵ $R_\epsilon > 0$ such that for every $|\xi| > R_\epsilon$*

$$|1 - u(\xi, t)| \leq B_\epsilon e^{-b_\epsilon |\xi|^2}, \quad |1 - v(\xi, t)| \leq B_\epsilon e^{-b_\epsilon |\xi|^2},$$

- *There exists a $\tilde{C} > 0$, such that for every $\xi \in G$, $t > 0$*

$$|u(\xi, t)| \leq \tilde{C}, \qquad |v(\xi, t)| \leq \tilde{C}.$$

•

$$\sup_{\xi\in G, 0\le t\le T}(u-v)(\xi,t) > M\epsilon^{\alpha}. \tag{14}$$

Then

$$\sup_{\substack{(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta),(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta)\in G,\\ 0\le t\le T}} \omega(\bar\xi,\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,t) = \sup_{\substack{d_0(\bar\xi,\bar\eta)\le r,\ |\xi|,|\eta|\le R_\epsilon\\ 0\le t\le T}} \omega(\bar\xi,\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,t)$$

where $r := \Big(\frac{2\gamma\tilde C}{\mu}\epsilon^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-1} - \frac{M\gamma}{4\mu}\epsilon^{\alpha+\frac{\gamma}{2}-1}\Big)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}$ *and* $\tilde R_\epsilon := r + \sqrt{\frac{4B_\epsilon}{Mb_\epsilon}\epsilon^{-\alpha}}$.

Proof. We first show that the supremum on the whole space is equal to the supremum under the condition that $d_0(\bar\xi,\bar\eta)\le r$. Indeed using (13) and (11) we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\substack{(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta),(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta)\in G,\\ 0\le t\le T}} \omega(\bar\xi,\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,t) &\ge \sup_{(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta)\in G, 0\le t\le T} \omega(\bar\xi,\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta,t)\\ &\ge M\epsilon^{\alpha} - \frac{M}{2T}\epsilon^{\alpha}T = \frac{M}{2}\epsilon^{\alpha} \ge \frac{M}{4}\epsilon^{\alpha}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that when $d_0(\bar\xi,\bar\eta)\ge r$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(\bar\xi,\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,t) \le& \sup_{(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta)\in G, 0\le t\le T} u(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta,t) + \sup_{(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta)\in G, 0\le t\le T}\Big(-v(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,t)\Big) - \frac{\mu}{\gamma}\epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} d_0(\bar\xi,\bar\eta)^{\gamma}\\ \le& 2\tilde C - \frac{\mu}{\gamma}\epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} d_0(\bar\xi,\bar\eta)^{\gamma} \le \frac{M}{4}\epsilon^{\alpha},\end{aligned}$$

due to the choice of r. Consequently by (14) we deduce that

$$\sup_{\substack{(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta),(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta)\in G,\\ 0\le t\le T}} \omega(\bar\xi,\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,t) = \sup_{\substack{(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta),\,(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta)\,\in\, G\ d_0(\bar\xi,\bar\eta)\,\le\, r,\\ 0\le t\le T}} \omega(\bar\xi,\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,t).$$

Now we show that the supremum is not acheived in a neighborhood of infinity. Indeed for $|(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta)|\ge \tilde R_{\epsilon_1}$, we see by the first assumption that

$$|1-v(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,t)| \le B_\epsilon \mathrm{e}^{-b_\epsilon|(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta)|^2} \le \frac{B_\epsilon}{b_\epsilon|(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta)|^2} \le \frac{M}{4}\epsilon^{\alpha}.$$

Analogously

$$|1-u(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta,t)| \le \frac{M}{4}\epsilon^{\alpha},$$

for $|(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta)|\ge\tilde R_\epsilon$. It follows that, if $|(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta)|$, $|(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta)|\ge\tilde R_\epsilon$

$$\omega(\bar\xi,\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,t) \le \big|1-u(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta,t)\big| + \big|1-v(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,t)\big| \le \frac{M}{2}\epsilon^{\alpha}.$$

Therefore we deduce that

$$\sup_{\substack{(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta),(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta)\in G,\\ 0\le t\le T}} \omega(\bar\xi,\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,t) = \sup_{\substack{(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta),\,(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta)\,\in\, G\,;\\ |\xi|_0\le\tilde R_\epsilon,\ 0\le t\le T}} \omega(\bar\xi,\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,t) = \omega(\hat\xi,\hat\eta,\hat\zeta,\hat t).$$

Finally we see that $\hat t>0$ must hold. Observe for $t=0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(\bar\xi,\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta,0) &= u_0(\bar\xi,\tilde\zeta) - u_0(\bar\eta,\tilde\zeta) - \frac{\mu}{\gamma}\epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} d_0(\bar\xi,\bar\eta)^{\gamma}\\ &\le d_0(\bar\xi,\bar\eta)\Big(\mathrm{Lip}(u_0) - \frac{\mu}{\gamma}\epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} d_0(\bar\xi,\bar\eta)^{\gamma-1}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Consider the first case with $d_0(\bar{\xi},\bar{\eta}) \leq \frac{1}{4\mathrm{Lip}(u_0)} M\epsilon^\alpha$. Then (15) can be written as

$$\omega(\bar{\xi},\bar{\eta},\tilde{\zeta},0) \leq \frac{M}{4}\epsilon^\alpha,$$

which together with the third assumption ensures that the maximum is not achieved at $t = 0$.

Now consider the second case where $d_0(\bar{\xi},\bar{\eta}) > \frac{1}{4\mathrm{Lip}(u_0)} M\epsilon^\alpha$. Then we observe that (12) and (15) give

$$\omega(\bar{\xi},\bar{\eta},\tilde{\zeta},0) \leq d_0(\bar{\xi},\bar{\eta})\Big(\mathrm{Lip}(u_0) - \frac{\mu}{\gamma}\epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} d_0(\bar{\xi},\bar{\eta})^{\gamma-1}\Big) \leq 0,$$

and employing the third assumption we obtain that $\hat{t} > 0$. □

Let us now provide the proof of our main theorem, Theorem 1.2.

Proof. We argue by contradiction and assume that for each $M \geq 0$ there exists $0 < \epsilon < 1$ such that

$$\sup_{\xi\in G, 0\leq t\leq T} |(u - u^\epsilon)(\xi,t)| > M\epsilon^\alpha.$$

Due to Theorem 2.1, Theorem 3.4 we can apply Lemma 4.1 and deduce that the function ω defined in (11) attains maximum at an interior point $(\hat{\xi},\bar{\hat{\eta}},\hat{\zeta},\hat{t})$ satisfying

$$d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}},\bar{\hat{\eta}}) \leq \Big(\frac{2\gamma\tilde{C}}{\mu}\epsilon^{\frac{\gamma}{2}-1} - \frac{M\gamma}{4\mu}\epsilon^{\alpha+\frac{\gamma}{2}-1}\Big)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}.$$

Since the function u is only Lipschitz, we replace the derivatives of u with the superjet $\mathcal{P}^{2,+}u(\xi,t)$ (see Subsection 2.1 for the superjet definition). Note that u^ϵ is smooth so we have $-X_i^\eta u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\eta}},\hat{\zeta},\hat{t}) = X_i^\eta\phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}},\bar{\hat{\eta}},\hat{t})$ and $-X_iX_j^\eta u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\eta}},\hat{\zeta},\hat{t}) \leq X_iX_j^\eta\phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}},\bar{\hat{\eta}},\hat{t})$.

We know by Theorem 8.3 in [11] that for every $\rho > 0$ there exist symmetric matrices X and Y such that

(i) $(a, \nabla_0^\xi\phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}},\bar{\hat{\eta}},\hat{t}), X) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+}u(\bar{\hat{\xi}},\tilde{\zeta},\hat{t})$

$(b, \nabla_0^\eta\phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}},\bar{\hat{\eta}},\hat{t}), Y) \in -\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{2,-}u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\eta}},\tilde{\zeta},\hat{t})$

(ii) $a + b = \frac{M}{2T}\epsilon^\alpha$

(iii) $-\Big(\frac{1}{\rho} + ||A||\Big)I \leq \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & Y \end{pmatrix} \leq A + \rho A^2$

where A is in our case defined as follows:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X_1^\xi X_1^\xi\phi & \frac{1}{2}(X_1^\xi X_2^\xi\phi + X_2^\xi X_1^\xi\phi) \\ \frac{1}{2}(X_1^\xi X_2^\xi\phi + X_2^\xi X_1^\xi\phi) & X_2^\xi X_2^\xi\phi \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} X_1^\xi X_1^\eta\phi & \frac{1}{2}(X_1^\xi X_2^\eta\phi + X_2^\xi X_1^\eta\phi) \\ \frac{1}{2}(X_1^\xi X_2^\eta\phi + X_2^\xi X_1^\eta\phi) & X_2^\xi X_2^\eta\phi \end{pmatrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} X_1^\eta X_1^\xi\phi & \frac{1}{2}(X_1^\eta X_2^\xi\phi + X_2^\eta X_1^\xi\phi) \\ \frac{1}{2}(X_1^\eta X_2^\xi\phi + X_2^\eta X_1^\xi\phi) & X_2^\eta X_2^\xi\phi \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} X_1^\eta X_1^\eta\phi & \frac{1}{2}(X_1^\eta X_2^\eta\phi + X_2^\eta X_1^\eta\phi) \\ \frac{1}{2}(X_1^\eta X_2^\eta\phi + X_2^\eta X_1^\eta\phi) & X_2^\eta X_2^\eta\phi \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix}.$$

In the sequel we will denote B the matrix such that

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} B & -B \\ -B & B \end{pmatrix}.$$

We employ (iii) and see for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that

$$z^T(X+Y)z = \begin{pmatrix} z^T, & z^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & Y \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} z^T, & z^T \end{pmatrix} (A + \rho A^2) \begin{pmatrix} z \\ z \end{pmatrix} = 0,$$

which means $X + Y \leq 0$.

Due to the fact that $(a, \nabla_0^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}), X) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{2,+} u(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \tilde{\zeta}, \hat{t})$ and u is a viscosity subsolution of (1) we have

$$a - \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \Big(\delta_{ij} - \frac{X_i^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) X_j^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t})}{|\nabla_0^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t})|^2}\Big) X_{ij} \leq 0, \quad \text{if} \quad \nabla_0^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) \neq 0, \tag{16}$$
$$a - (\delta_{ij} - p_i p_j) X_{ij} \leq 0, \quad \text{for some} \quad |p| \leq 1, \quad \text{if} \quad \nabla_0^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) = 0.$$

Moreover since u^ϵ is smooth we have $\partial_t u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{\zeta}, \hat{t}) = -b$. Hence since it is a solution it satisfies:

$$b = -\partial_t u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{\zeta}, \hat{t}) = -\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \Big(\delta_{ij} - \frac{X_i^\eta u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) X_j^\eta u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t})}{|\nabla_0^\eta u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t})|^2}\Big) X_i^\eta X_j^\eta u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{\zeta}, \hat{t}) = \tag{17}$$
$$= -\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \Big(\delta_{ij} - \frac{X_i^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) X_j^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t})}{|\nabla_0^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t})|^2}\Big) X_i^\eta X_j^\eta u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{\zeta}, \hat{t}),$$

where we have used the fact that $\nabla_0^\eta u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{\zeta}, \hat{t}) = -\nabla_0^\eta \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t})$ at the maximum point and $-\nabla_0^\eta \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) = \nabla_0^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t})$ by the choice of ϕ. Also note that

$$-X_i^\eta X_j^\eta u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{\zeta}, \hat{t}) \leq X_i^\eta X_j^\eta \phi(\bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{\zeta}, \hat{t}), \quad -X_i^\eta X_j^\eta u^\epsilon(\bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{\zeta}, \hat{t}) \leq Y_{ij}.$$

Now we distinguish two cases: $\nabla_0^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) \neq 0$ and $\nabla_0^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) = 0$. Let us first consider the case with $\nabla_0^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) \neq 0$. Then summing (17) and (16) we obtain

$$\frac{M\epsilon^\alpha}{2T} = a + b \tag{18}$$
$$\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \Big(\delta_{ij} - \frac{X_i^\xi \phi X_j^\xi \phi}{|\nabla_0^\xi \phi|^2}\Big)(X_{ij} - X_i^\eta X_j^\eta u^\epsilon) - \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \frac{\epsilon^2 X_i^\xi \phi X_j^\xi \phi}{(\epsilon^2 + |\nabla_0^\xi \phi|^2)|\nabla_0^\xi \phi|^2} X_i^\eta X_j^\eta u^\epsilon$$
$$\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \Big(\delta_{ij} - \frac{X_i^\xi \phi X_j^\xi \phi}{|\nabla_0^\xi \phi|^2}\Big)(X_{ij} + Y_{ij}) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \frac{\epsilon^2 X_i^\xi \phi X_j^\xi \phi}{(\epsilon^2 + |\nabla_0^\xi \phi|^2)|\nabla_0^\xi \phi|^2} (X_i^\eta X_j^\eta)\phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t})$$
$$\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \frac{\epsilon^2 X_i^\xi \phi X_j^\xi \phi}{(\epsilon^2 + |\nabla_0^\xi \phi|^2)|\nabla_0^\xi \phi|^2} (X_i^\eta X_j^\eta)\phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}).$$

where we have used the fact that $X + Y \leq 0$. Now we estimate the last term

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \frac{\epsilon^2 X_i^\xi \phi X_j^\xi \phi}{(\epsilon^2 + |\nabla_0^\xi \phi|^2)|\nabla_0^\xi \phi|^2} (X_i^\eta X_j^\eta)\phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{\epsilon^2 + |\nabla_0^\xi \phi|^2} (X_2^\eta X_2^\eta)\phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}),$$

since $X_1^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) = 0$. In SE(2) function ϕ becomes

$$\phi(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta}, t) = \frac{\mu}{\gamma} \epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} d_0(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\eta})^\gamma + \frac{M}{2T} \epsilon^\alpha t = \frac{\mu}{\gamma} \epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} (\sin^2(\theta_\xi - \theta_\eta))^{\gamma/2} + \frac{M}{2T} \epsilon^\alpha t.$$

Hence we have:

$$X_2^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) = \frac{1}{2} \mu \epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{\gamma-2} \sin(2(\theta_{\hat{\xi}} - \theta_{\hat{\eta}})) \geq \frac{1}{2} \mu \epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{\gamma-1},$$

since we can assume that $\theta_{\hat{\xi}} - \theta_{\hat{\eta}}$ is arbitrarily small. In addition

$$X_2^\xi X_2^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) =$$
$$= \frac{1}{4} \mu \epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} (\gamma - 2) d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{\gamma-4} \sin^2(2(\theta_{\hat{\xi}} - \theta_{\hat{\eta}})) + \mu \epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{\gamma-2} \cos(2(\theta_{\hat{\xi}} - \theta_{\hat{\eta}}))$$
$$\leq \mu \epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \gamma d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{\gamma-2}.$$

The same inequalities are satisfied also by the distance we chose in H^1:

$$|X_2^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t})| \geq \frac{1}{2}\mu\epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}} d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{\gamma-1}, \quad X_2^\xi X_2^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t}) \leq \mu\epsilon^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}}\gamma d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{\gamma-2}.$$

Hence plugging these properties in (18) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\epsilon^2 X_2^\xi X_2^\xi \phi}{\epsilon^2 + |X_2^\xi \phi|^2} \leq & \frac{\mu\epsilon^{3-\frac{\gamma}{2}}\gamma d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{\gamma-2}}{\epsilon^2 + \mu^2\epsilon^{2-\gamma} d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{2\gamma-2}} \\ = & \gamma\mu^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\epsilon^{\frac{\gamma-2}{2(\gamma-1)}} \frac{\epsilon^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}\mu^{\frac{\gamma-2}{\gamma-1}}\epsilon^{-\frac{(\gamma-2)^2}{2(\gamma-1)}} d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{\gamma-2}}{\epsilon^2 + \mu^2\epsilon^{2-\gamma} d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{2\gamma-2}}.\end{aligned}$$

We employ Young's inequality $mn \leq \frac{1}{p}m^p + \frac{1}{q}n^q$ with $p = \frac{2(\gamma-1)}{\gamma}$ and $q = \frac{2(\gamma-1)}{\gamma-2}$ in order to find

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{M}{2T}\epsilon^\alpha \leq & \gamma\mu^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\epsilon^{\frac{\gamma-2}{2(\gamma-1)}} \frac{\frac{\gamma}{2(\gamma-1)}\epsilon^2 + \frac{\gamma-2}{2(\gamma-1)}\mu^2\epsilon^{2-\gamma} d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{2\gamma-2}}{\epsilon^2 + \mu^2\epsilon^{2-\gamma} d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}})^{2\gamma-2}} \\ \leq & C_1\mu^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\epsilon^{\frac{\gamma-2}{2(\gamma-1)}} = C_1\Big(\frac{\gamma 4^\gamma \mathrm{Lip}(u_0)^\gamma}{M^{\gamma-1}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\epsilon^\alpha = C_2\epsilon^\alpha M^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

where we used μ and γ definitions given by (12) and (10), respectively. This result is a contradiction for large M values, proving the assertion of the theorem if the gradient of ϕ vanishes at the maximum point.

Now we look at the case with $|\nabla_0^\xi \phi(\hat{\xi}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{t})| = 0$. Using (16) we write (18) as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{M}{2T}\epsilon^\alpha = & a + b \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{2}(\delta_{ij} - p_i p_j)X_{ij} - \sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\delta_{ij} X_i^\eta X_j^\eta u^\epsilon \\ & \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{2}(\delta_{ij} - p_i p_j)(X_{ij} + Y_{ij}) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} p_i p_j X_i^\eta X_j^\eta \phi.\end{aligned}$$

In both SE(2) and H^1 settings $|\nabla_0^\xi \phi(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}, \hat{t})| = 0$ implies $d_0(\bar{\hat{\xi}}, \bar{\hat{\eta}}) = 0$ and $X_i^\eta X_j^\eta \phi = 0$. Moreover $X + Y \leq 0$. Finally we obtain the contradiction: $\frac{M}{2T}\epsilon^\alpha \leq 0$ in both settings. □

Remark. *The same proof holds in general Carnot group of step 2. The generalization is made by considering an arbitrary horizontal variable* $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_n)$ *and by choosing* $\bar{\xi} = \xi_2$.

References

[1] Altschuler, S. J., M. A. Grayson, et al. (1991). *Shortening space curves and flow through singularities.* Institute for Mathematics and its Applications (USA).

[2] Bonfiglioli, A., E. Lanconelli, F. Uguzzoni, et al. (2002). Uniform gaussian estimates for the fundamental solutions for heat operators on carnot groups. *Advances in Differential equations 7*(10), 1153–1192.

[3] Brakke, K. (1978). The motion ofa surface by its mean curvature. *Mathematical Notes Series, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ*.

[4] Capogna, L. and G. Citti (2009). Generalized mean curvature flow in carnot groups. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations 34*(8), 937–956.

[5] Capogna, L., G. Citti, and C. S. G. Magnani (2013). Sub-riemannian heat kernels and mean curvature flow of graphs. *Journal of Functional Analysis 264*(8), 1899–1928.

[6] Capogna, L., D. Danielli, S. D. Pauls, and J. Tyson (2007). *An introduction to the Heisenberg group and the sub-Riemannian isoperimetric problem*, Volume 259. Springer Science & Business Media.

[7] Chen, Y. G., Y. Giga, S. Goto, et al. (1991). Uniqueness and existence of viscosity solutions of generalized mean curvature flow equations. *J. Differential Geom 33*(3), 749–786.

[8] Cheng, J.-H., J.-F. Hwang, A. Malchiodi, and P. Yang (2005). Minimal surfaces in pseudohermitian geometry. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze 4*(1), 129–177.

[9] Citti, G., B. Franceschiello, G. Sanguinetti, and A. Sarti (2015). Sub-riemannian mean curvature flow for image processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.03710*.

[10] Citti, G. and A. Sarti (2006). A cortical based model of perceptual completion in the roto-translation space. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision 24*(3), 307–326.

[11] Crandall, M. G., H. Ishii, and P.-L. Lions (1992). User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society 27*(1), 1–67.

[12] Danielli, D., N. Garofalo, and D.-M. Nhieu (2007). Sub-riemannian calculus on hypersurfaces in carnot groups. *Advances in Mathematics 215*(1), 292–378.

[13] Deckelnick, K. (2000). Error bounds for a difference scheme approximating viscosity solutions of mean curvature flow. *Interfaces and Free Boundaries 2*(2), 117–142.

[14] Dirr, N., F. Dragoni, and M. von Renesse (2010). Evolution by mean curvature flow in sub-riemannian geometries. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics 9*(2), 307–326.

[15] Evans, L. C. and J. Spruck (1992a). Motion of level sets by mean curvature. ii. *Transactions of the american mathematical society 330*(1), 321–332.

[16] Evans, L. C. and J. Spruck (1992b). Motion of level sets by mean curvature iii. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis 2*(2), 121–150.

[17] Evans, L. C. and J. Spruck (1995). Motion of level sets by mean curvature iv. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis 5*(1), 77–114.

[18] Evans, L. C., J. Spruck, et al. (1991). Motion of level sets by mean curvature i. *J. Diff. Geom 33*(3), 635–681.

[19] Ferrari, F., Q. Liu, and J. J. Manfredi (2014). On the horizontal mean curvature flow for axisymmetric surfaces in the heisenberg group. *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics 16*(03), 1350027.

[20] Franchi, B., R. Serapioni, and F. S. Cassano (2003). Regular hypersurfaces, intrinsic perimeter and implicit function theorem in carnot groups. *Communications in analysis and geometry 11*(5), 909–944.

[21] Gage, M. et al. (1983). An isoperimetric inequality with applications to curve shortening. *Duke Math. J 50*(4), 1225–1229.

[22] Gage, M. and R. S. Hamilton (1986). The heat equation shrinking convex plane curves. *Journal of Differential Geometry 23*(1), 69–96.

[23] Gage, M. E. (1984). Curve shortening makes convex curves circular. *Inventiones mathematicae 76*(2), 357–364.

[24] Grayson, M. A. (1987). The heat equation shrinks embedded plane curves to round points. *Journal of Differential geometry 26*(2), 285–314.

[25] Huisken, G. et al. (1984). *Flow by mean curvature of convex surfaces into spheres*. Australian National University, Centre for Mathematical Analysis.

[26] Merriman, B., J. K. Bence, and S. Osher (1992). *Diffusion generated motion by mean curvature*. Department of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles.

[27] Montgomery, R. (2006). *A tour of subriemannian geometries, their geodesics and applications*. Number 91. American Mathematical Soc.

[28] Petitot, J. and Y. Tondut (1999). Vers une neurogéométrie. fibrations corticales, structures de contact et contours subjectifs modaux. *Mathématiques informatique et sciences humaines* (145), 5–102.